REMARKS

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview on November 10, 2005. As requested in the Interview Summary form PTOL-413 mailed by the Examiner on November 15, 2005, and in accordance with MPEP Section 713.04, the substance of the interview is included herein. No exhibits were shown. Claim 1 was discussed with respect to the cited reference Stanfill '072. Applicant's representative described the general subject matter of the application with reference to FIGS. 18 – 20. The Examiner requested further clarity in claim 1. Stanfill was discussed with reference to FIG. 2. Applicant's representative agreed to provide a proposed amendment to more clearly recite the subject matter sought in the pending claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

All pending claims 1, 3 – 5, 8 – 9, 11 – 14, 16 – 18, 21 – 22, 24 – 27, 29 – 31, 34 – 35, and 37 – 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Stanfill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,072, hereinafter "Stanfill '072").

Independent claims 1, 14, and 27

Claims 1, 14, and 17 have been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter which the Applicant seeks to protect, as proposed to the Examiner following the telephone interview of November 10, 2005. Applicant submits that Stanfill does not disclose or suggest at least "[determining] whether a value for each of the runtime parameters is to be provided by user input; [determining] whether a value for each of the runtime parameters is to be externally supplied programmatically, ... [and modifying] the graph-based representation of the application using the determined parameter values for the runtime parameters," as recited in claims 1, 14, and 27.

Independent claims 9, 22, and 35

Applicant : Wholey, et al.
Serial No. : 09/627,252
Filed : July 28, 2000
Page : 12 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07470-050001

The Examiner stated that the rejection of claim 1 applies to rejection of claims 9, 12, 14, 22, 25, 27, 35, and 38. However, none of the portions of Stanfill '072 cited by the Examiner with respect to the rejection of claim 1, or any other portion of Stanfill '072, teaches or suggests at least "(a) determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having an associated condition and an associated condition-interpretation; (b) evaluating the associated condition for every such conditional component; (c) modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by removing such conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph, based on an evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation for such conditional component." Therefore, claims 9, 22, and 35 are patentable.

Independent claims 12, 25, and 38

The Examiner stated that the rejection of claim 1 applies to rejection of claims 9, 12, 14, 22, 25, 27, 35, and 38. However, none of the portions of Stanfill '072 cited by the Examiner with respect to the rejection of claim 1, or any other portion of Stanfill '072, teaches or suggests at least "(a) determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a an associated condition and an associated condition-interpretation; (b) evaluating the associated condition for every such conditional component; (c) modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding associated condition-interpretation of at least one such conditional component by replacing such conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on an evaluation of the associated condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component." Therefore, claims 12, 25, and 38 are patentable.

Dependent claims 3-5, 8, 11, 13, 16-18, 21, 24, 26-27, 29-31, 34, 37, and 39

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as those set forth above for the independent claims upon which they respectively depend.

Applicant believes that the claims presented herein fully address the Examiner's concerns in the telephone interview of November 10, 2005, and that no new search should be necessary. Applicant respectfully submits that the application should now be in a condition for allowance.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-7-05

Elliott J. Mason, III
Reg. No. 56,569

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21221389.doc